

**VILLAGE OF COLD SPRING PLANNING BOARD**  
**85 MAIN STRET, COLD SPRING, NEW YORK 10516**  
*Workshop meeting*

*June 17, 2010*

**Present:** Chairman: Joseph Barbaro; **Members:** Karen Doyle, Joseph Immorlica, Arne Saari & Placito Sgro  
Also present for the Village was Rob Cameron (Engineering Consultant) from Putnam Engineering

**Gus Serroukas, Foodtown Plaza, Chestnut St.**

Present for the applicant: Gus Serroukas & Mike McCormack Architect from Liscum, McCormack & VanVoorhis LLP

Chairman **J. Barbaro** introduced the Board and Mr. Cameron. He told the public there is no speaking at this meeting they can write a letter to acknowledge their concerns or wait and speak at the public hearing.

The meeting will be done in three stages:

1. The Memorandum which discusses Mr. Cameron's findings on examination of the site plan.
- 2 each member of the Planning Board will state concerns
3. Suggest site plan changes which will be discussed and polled among each member.

**J. Barbaro** noted that the site plan shows a parking lot (being referred to as lot B) and staging area which was not the applicant's idea. It was the Planning Boards idea. The Village Board would have to change the zoning of that lot for it to be used as a parking lot.

The Board read and reviewed Putnam Engineering's Memorandum dated June 15, 2010(attached) which consists of 16 items of concern from Mr. Cameron.

**K. Doyle** noted the Planning Board did not vote and discuss the lot (lot B) on Marion Ave. to be used as a parking lot.

**J. Barbaro** read M.A. Day Engineering, PC responses to the Putman Engineering Memorandum dated June 17, 2010.

**K. Doyle** asked what the parking study would consist of. **P. Sgro** noted a parking study should not be done until the parking lot situation is confirmed. **J. Immorlica** agreed and noted the storm water study should be on hold also. **K. Doyle** and **A. Saari** noted they would like to see the traffic study done now. Mr. Cameron noted the traffic study can be done Mr. Cameron noted that it is up to the Board to determine what day the study should be done on. **K. Doyle** noted there was no mention on the Putnam Engineering memorandum regarding pedestrian safety and congestion. Mr. Cameron noted the traffic study does not determine congestion and pedestrian safety.

**J. Immorlica** noted he previously suggested to the applicant to go down into a basement instead of what is being proposed which is all on one floor. **J. Immorlica** noted the post office should continue to use the existing loading dock.

**J. Immorlica** noted that New York State recently made changes regarding storm water regulations.

**K. Doyle** asked for more clarification regarding turning from Route 9D.

**K. Doyle** asked for clarification regarding the loading dock.

**A. Saari** noted when he passed by the Foodtown Plaza today, only 4 cars were parked on 9D and none behind the building. Mr. Cameron noted he thought the gravel lot (lot B) was going to be for employee parking and Post Office truck parking.

**K Doyle** asked for clarification of the black line on the site plan. **J. Immorlica** noted the black line on the site plan is the edge of the driveway.

Part 2 of meeting Chairman Barbaro explained that each member will now speak.

**P. Sgro** noted the following:

- He put together a lot of issues that had to be addressed when he received the latest version.
- The site plan does not show all the issues that were previously discussed.
- The new plan does not reflect any wishes the board requested at the last meeting. Ex. More setbacks were asked for and no set backs were added to the plan.
- Also the site plan on the corner lot referred to Village Code # 111-15G West side of Marion Ave. that section should be clear.
- The new plan shows that staging area with sidewalk on other side of staging area. That staging area was asked to be removed and it was put back on the plan. Sidewalk is shown as a buffer between the staging area and parking lot, which doesn't make any sense.
- He noted if they went down to a basement, part of the post office can be in line with loading dock. It was almost possible to meet the code requirements on that corner. 6–8 feet of space can be picked up to create a site view around the corner.
- **P. Sgro** felt offsite drainage could be resolved in another way from what is currently there. Currently, there is a manhole that accepts drainage but, that does not work. A catch basin can be put there which would allow for better drainage.
- **P. Sgro** suggested that the post office should be placed on the lot (lot B) instead of a parking lot.
- **P. Sgro** noted in his opinion this project is asking for too much to be approved.
- He also noted that he will recommend that employees park in that parking area only and in his opinion, he does not like the plan and in his opinion he can't see how the proposal will be approved because there are no setbacks and he does not see how ZBA will approve it either.

**J. Immorlica** stated the following:

- He added on to P. Sgro's idea of moving the post office to lot B instead of using lot B as a parking lot.
- Deliveries and pick up can be done completely off the street.

The lot will support the space required by the post office and will also allow trucks to park there.

- **J. Immorlica** also noted that the applicant will have to ask the Mayor and Board of Trustees to approve spot zoning a new zone.
- **J. Immorlica** also noted that other parties are considering relocating the post office and suggested throwing parking requirements out.
- **J. Immorlica** suggested putting the flag pole on top of the building, moving the dumpster location and relocating guide wires underground.
- **J. Immorlica** noted trucks for loading and unloading can be taken off Marion Ave completely.

**K. Doyle** noted the proposal shows a lot of difficulties, an ambitious difficult proposal and the big question is: Does the applicant have a commitment from the post office? **K. Doyle** noted that recently there was a lot of public comment at the ZBA public hearing and suggested the applicant and the Planning Board should go back and review the letters. **K. Doyle** also noted the following and asked that the applicant address each item in his next submission:

- There is currently truck congestion, the traffic flow is disrupted.
- There is no landscaping addressed on the plan.
- There is no lighting shown on the plans.
- Snow removal is a good question.
- There is no traffic flow or pedestrian safety shown on the plan.
- The plan does not show Historic District Boundries and homes (on Benedict Rd.) adjacent to lot B.
- She would like to see which trees (at least 6 inch caliper) on lot B that will be removed.
- Topographical information such as sloping should be shown on the plans.
- Easements including conditions should be noted on the plans.
- Village Code #126-35 deals with no parking at any time, not parking on the west side of Marion Ave. Village Code #126-40 excludes trucks, which excludes staging trucks to provide for uninterrupted traffic flow.

**A. Saari** made the following comments:

- He asked if Foodtown used the basement as storage. **J. Immorlica** noted that Foodtown has storage in the basement with a big elevator downstairs. **A. Saari** noted that there is precedence set since Foodtown has a basement they are using.
- **A. Saari** also noted that a traffic study could suggest the need for a one way street or the need for a traffic light. If you look at contours water is running up Marion Ave. He noted he is looking forward to the traffic study results.
- **A. Saari** suggested more esthetics in the back of the building when a building is accessible from more than one side
- He noted the current drainage system is not an efficient system. Catch basins fill and lay stagnant.

**J. Barbaro** noted the following:

- Lack of greenery on Marion Ave.
- The zero set-back is a problem.
- He suggested to the applicant to go down to the basement instead of out.
- The point of this meeting is to give direction.

Part 3 of meeting is for the board to make suggestions.

The Chairman suggested the Board vote on suggestions made by board members to see what changes should be made to the plan.

- **P. Sgro** again stated his concerns regarding the following:
- the safety of cars, exiting the exit ramp with no setbacks.
- Safety factors are the most important and residents concerns are also a concern.
- Building must be put in line with the loading dock for the perfect view of exiting the parking lot.

**J. Immorlica** noted he has the following choices:

1. Go with plan
2. Go downstairs
3. Go with P. Sgro's idea of putting the post office on lot B.

**J. Barbaro** asked the Planning Board members which choice they prefer. Mr. McCormack noted the project will probably fail if the post office will not be willing to go down and if the Board sticks with the requirements discussed.

**K. Doyle** noted that dialog with the post office is imperative before going forward.

**P. Sgro** noted in good faith he would not be able to go against the code requirements and suggested they Board needs a workable plan.

**J. Immorlica** noted that a lease should be executed before going forward.

**J. Barbaro** noted the Board members all agree the applicant should contact the U.S. Postal Service to see if they would be willing to use 2 levels.

**J. Barbaro** asked if the applicant has any questions. The applicant will contact the post office and the applicant will notify the board to schedule another workshop.

**K. Doyle** noted a lot of consideration has gone into this proposal.

The applicant presented the Board with a copy of the lease agreement with Foodtown regarding the use of the post office space when the post office lease expires. **J. Immorlica** moved to adjourn the meeting and **A Saari** seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 pm.

---

J. Barbaro, Planning Board Chairman

---

Date